

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action mailed on **12 June 2007**, the Examiner points out that the amendment mailed on **1 June 2007** includes 3 new claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the 3 new claims, i.e., claims 55-57, correspond to previously cancelled claims 12, 30, and 48. Specifically, claim 55 restores the cancelled claim 12, claim 56 restores the cancelled claim 30, and claim 57 restores the cancelled claim 48. Claims 12, 30, and 48 remain cancelled. No new matter has been added.

In the Advisory Action filed on **12 June 2007**, the Examiner did not indicate if the amendment files on **1 June 2007** will be entered or will not be entered. Hence, Applicant assumes that the amendment filed on **1 June 2007 will not be entered**. Consequently, Applicant respectfully resubmits the amendment filed on **1 June 2007** and the accompany remarks/arguments below.

In the Official Action mailed on **2 April 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-11, 13-29, 31-47, and 49-54. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruce Schneier (*Applied Cryptography 2nd Edition*, Oct. 1995, John Wiley & Sons Pub. pages 43-57, hereinafter “Schneier”) in view of Medvinski et al (*Public Key Utilizing Tickets for Application Servers*, hereinafter “Medvinski”) and Kohl et al (*The Kerberos Network Authentication Service, Network Working Group Request For Comments (RFC) 1510*, Sept. 1993, hereinafter “Kohl”). Claims 14, 17, 32, 35, 50, and 53 were rejected as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of Medvinski. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 38, 39, 42, 43, 46, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of

Medvinski and Sirbu et al (*Public Key Based Ticket Granting service in Kerberos*, hereinafter “Sirbu”) and ON.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 19, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of Medvinski and Kohl.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Schneier, Medvinski and Kohl suggests that a KDC is the creator/issuer of a new temporary secret key when an old temporary secret key expires (see Kohl, Sec. 2.3: Renewable Tickets, “*The KDC will issue a new ticket with a new session key and a later expiration time.*”)

In contrast, the instant application teaches that the server receives a request from the KDC to generate a new temporary secret key and the server subsequently generates this new temporary secret key (see page 10, lines 25-27 and page 11, lines 12-20 of the instant application). There is nothing within Schneier, Medvinski and Kohl, either separately, or in concert, which suggests that the server receives a request from the KDC to generate a new temporary secret key and subsequently generates the key.

Accordingly, and following Examiner’s suggestion in the instant Office Action, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 19, and 37 to clarify that a new temporary secret key is generated by the server in response to a request from the KDC for a new temporary secret key. These amendments find support on page 10, lines 25-27 and page 11, lines 12-20 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Applicant has also moved certain limitations from independent claims 1, 19, and 37 into new dependent claims 55, 56, and 57, respectively. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 19, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also

submits that claims 2-11, 13-18, and 55, which depend upon claim 1, claims 21-29, 31-36, and 56, which depend upon claim 19, and claims 38-47, 49-54, and 57, which depend upon claim 37, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 16 July 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com